1	SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (SCSBN 9990) United States Attorney	
2	MARK L. KROTOSKI (CASBN 138549)	
3	Chief, Criminal Division	
4	BENJAMIN T. KENNEDY (CASBN 241350) Assistant United States Attorney	
5	150 Almaden Boulevard	
6	San Jose, California 95113 Telephone: (408) 535-5059	
7	Facsimile: (408) 535-5066 Email: benjamin.t.kennedy@usdoj.gov	
8	Attorneys for the United States of America	
9		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
12	SAN JOSE DIVISION	
13		
14	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	No. CR 07-00341 JF
15	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME FROM JUNI
16	$ \begin{array}{c c} \hline v. \end{array} $	13, 2007 TO JULY 12, 2007 FROM THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT CALCULATION
17	JAVIER VADILLO-PINEDA, ) a/k/a, JAVIER BADILLO-PINEDA, )	(18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A))
18		
19		
20	On June 13, 2007 the parties appeared for a hearing before this Court. At that hearing,	
21	defense counsel requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act based upon defense	
22	counsel's need to effectively prepare by reviewing the defendant's A file and other discovery	
23	materials submitted by the government. At that time, the Court set the matter for a hearing on	
24	July 12, 2007.	
25	The parties stipulate that the time between June 13, 2007 and July 12, 2007 is excluded	
26	under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §3161, and agree that the failure to grant the requested	
27	continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective	
28	preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Finally, the parties agree that the	

Document 10

Case 5:07-cr-00341-JF

Filed 06/15/2007

Page 2 of 3

1 ORDER

Based upon the stipulation of the parties, and for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the time between June 13, 2007 and July 12, 2007 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §3161. The court finds that the failure to grant the requested continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Furthermore, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases. The court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED:

JEREMY FOGEL UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE